

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-56 and 59-72 are pending in the application. In this Office action, claims 22-32 and 60-62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), notwithstanding these claims were previously allowed. Claims 63-68 stand objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1-21, 33-56, 59, and 69-72 stand allowed.

In this paper, claims 22-32, 60, and 62-68 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claim 61 has been amended to change its dependency. Claims 73-78 have been added and are essentially claims 63-68, respectively, rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of claims 60 and 62. The amendments are believed to place the claims in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 22-32 and 60-62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,790,256 to Brown et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,025,476 to Gould et al. The rejection is traversed.

Applicant incorporates all the arguments previously presented in traversal of the rejection of claims 22-32 and 60-62 as though set forth fully herein.

Claims 22-32, 60, and 62 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claim 61 has been amended to change its dependency from claim 60 to rewritten claims 73-78, which have been indicated as allowable. Thus, the rejection of claims 22-32 and 60-62 is moot.

Applicant requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 22-32.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 63-68 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims

Serial No.: 10/604,418
Filed: July 18, 2003
Page 16 of 16

Examiner: Yaritza Guadalupe McCall
Group Art Unit: 2859

73-78 are essentially claims 63-68, respectively, rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of claims 60 and 62, while avoiding redundancies. The limitations of claim 61 are not incorporated into claims 73-78 because such limitations are believed to be unnecessary for patentability of claims 73-78. Thus, claims 73-78 are allowable. Claim 61 has been amended to depend, alternatively, from claims 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, and 78. Thus, claim 61 is allowable.

Applicant requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 60-62, and the allowance of claims 61 and 73-78.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, all of the claims are in condition for allowance. Early notification of allowability is requested. If there are any remaining issues which the Examiner believes may be resolved in an interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

ADRIANO ROSA

Dated: February 16, 2006

By: /Michael F Kelly/
Michael F. Kelly, Reg. No 50,859
John E. McGarry Reg. No. 22,360
McGARRY BAIR PC
171 Monroe Avenue, NW, Suite 600
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
616-742-3500